

Washington University in St. Louis Washington University Open Scholarship

Topics in Quantum Mechanics

Chemistry

Spring 3-6-2013

Transformation Theory

Ronald Lovett

Washington University in St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/chem_papers



Part of the [Chemistry Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lovett, Ronald, "Transformation Theory" (2013). *Topics in Quantum Mechanics*. 29.
https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/chem_papers/29

This Classroom Handout is brought to you for free and open access by the Chemistry at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Topics in Quantum Mechanics by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

Transformation Theory

References

The Principles of Quantum Mechanics, P. A. M. Dirac (QC174.3 D5 1958).

Quantum Mechanics, E. Merzbacher (Chem QC174.1 M36).

The general structure of quantum mechanical questions

There are three steps in every quantum mechanical experiment.

① Prepare a system - *make a measure on some observable*

Let a state be prepared by measuring an observable \hat{A} . If

$$\hat{A} \psi_a = a \psi_a, \quad \{a, \psi_a\} \sim \text{the set of eigenvalues, eigenvectors of } \hat{A},$$

we can start the system in

$$\Psi(0) = \psi_a$$

by choosing systems for which an observation of \hat{A} at $t = 0$ finds a .

② Wait in time

If $\hat{H} \chi_n = E_n \chi_n$, the initial state

$$\Psi(0) = \sum_n \langle \chi_n | \psi_a \rangle \chi_n$$

evolves in time into

$$\Psi(t) = \sum_n e^{-iE_n t/\hbar} \langle \chi_n | \psi_a \rangle \chi_n.$$

③ Observe some quantity.

If $\hat{B} \phi_b = b \phi_b$, observation of \hat{B} will reveal the value b with probability

$$|\langle \phi_b | \Psi(t) \rangle|^2 = \left| \sum_n \langle \phi_b | \chi_n \rangle e^{-iE_n t/\hbar} \langle \chi_n | \psi_a \rangle \right|^2. \quad (1)$$

probability of the value of B

Unitary transformations - a linear transformation.

A transformation \hat{U} is linear if

$$\hat{U}(a\psi_1 + b\psi_2) = a(\hat{U}\psi_1) + b(\hat{U}\psi_2)$$

for all a, b, ψ_1, ψ_2 . A linear transformation \hat{U} is unitary if

$$\langle \hat{U}\psi_1 | \hat{U}\psi_2 \rangle = \langle \psi_1 | \psi_2 \rangle$$

for all ψ_1, ψ_2 .

The 3D vector analogue for this would be that

$$(\hat{U}\vec{v}) \cdot (\hat{U}\vec{w}) = \vec{v} \cdot \vec{w}$$

for all \vec{v}, \vec{w} . This is valid for *rotations* in 3D. Thus a unitary transformation is a complex, multidimensional extension of a rotation. [For *real* multidimensional vectors these are called *orthogonal* transformations.]

How do you know if a transformation is unitary or not?

Matrix representations of unitary transformations

In an orthonormal basis set $\{\phi_n\}$, \hat{U} would have a matrix representation

$$U_{mn} = \langle \phi_m | \hat{U} \phi_n \rangle.$$

If ψ_a, ψ_b are two (arbitrary) vectors with the matrix representations

$$\rightarrow \psi_a = \sum_n a_n \phi_n,$$

$$\rightarrow \psi_b = \sum_n b_n \phi_n,$$

then

$$\langle \psi_a | \psi_b \rangle = \sum_n a_n^* b_n.$$

Since

$$\hat{U}\psi_a = \sum_n a_n \hat{U}\phi_n = \sum_{n,k} a_n \langle \phi_k | \hat{U}\phi_n \rangle \phi_k = \sum_{k,n} \phi_k U_{kn} a_n,$$

$$\langle \hat{U}\psi_a | \hat{U}\psi_b \rangle = \sum_{k,m,n} U_{km}^* a_m^* U_{kn} b_n$$

Thus \hat{U} is unitary \iff

$$\sum_n a_n^* b_n = \sum_{k,m,n} U_{km}^* a_m^* U_{kn} b_n, \quad \text{all } a_m, b_n$$

$$a_n^* = \sum_{k,m} a_m^* U_{km}^* U_{kn}, \quad \text{all } a_m$$

$$\delta_{mn} = \sum_k U_{km}^* U_{kn}. \quad (2)$$

Now the inverse operator \hat{U}^{-1} is the operator for which

$$\hat{U}^{-1} \cdot \hat{U} = \hat{1},$$

with $\hat{1}$ the *identity* operator. Since the matrix representation for $\hat{1}$ is δ_{mn} ,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{mn} &= \langle \phi_m | \hat{U}^{-1} \hat{U} | \phi_n \rangle \\ &= \sum_k [\hat{U}^{-1}]_{mk} U_{kn}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparison with (2) shows that \hat{U} is *unitary* $\iff [\hat{U}^{-1}]_{mn} = U_{nm}^*$.

Contrast these two cases: If you transpose and take the complex conjugate of a matrix, you get

- (i) the original matrix if the matrix represents an Hermitian operator,
- (ii) the inverse of the original matrix if the matrix represents generates a unitary transformation.

Basis set transformations are unitary transformations

Let $\{\phi_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis set, let \hat{T} be a linear transformation, and let

$$\psi_k = \hat{T} \phi_k$$

be the vector into which \hat{T} transforms ϕ_k . In matrix form,

$$\psi_k = \sum_n \langle \phi_n | \hat{T} \phi_k \rangle \phi_n = \sum_n T_{nk} \phi_n$$

with

$$T_{nk} = \langle \phi_n | \psi_k \rangle = \langle \phi_n | \hat{T} \phi_k \rangle.$$

\hat{T} will give a transformation to a new orthonormal basis set if

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{k\ell} &= \langle \psi_k | \psi_\ell \rangle \\ &= \sum_{m,n} \langle T_{mk} \phi_m | T_{n\ell} \phi_n \rangle \\ &= \sum_{m,n} T_{mk}^* T_{n\ell} \langle \phi_m | \phi_n \rangle \\ &= \sum_n T_{nk}^* T_{n\ell}\end{aligned}$$

which shows (compare this with (2)) that T_{ij} is the matrix representation of a unitary transformation. That is, a 'rotation' of an orthonormal basis set gives a new orthonormal basis set.

The T_{nk} are, of course, the components of ψ_k in the basis set $\{\phi_n\}$. Writing $T_{nk} = \psi_k^{(n)}$,

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^{(1)} & \psi_2^{(1)} & \cdots \\ \psi_1^{(2)} & \psi_2^{(2)} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = [\tilde{\psi}_1 | \tilde{\psi}_2 | \cdots]$$

The transpose of this matrix is

$$\tilde{T} = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^{(1)} & \psi_2^{(1)} & \cdots \\ \psi_1^{(2)} & \psi_2^{(2)} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\psi}_1 \\ \tilde{\psi}_2 \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix}$$

If we take the complex conjugate of this array, it is clear that the product

$$T \cdot \tilde{T}^* = [\langle \psi_k | \psi_\ell \rangle^*] = [\delta_{k\ell}^*] = \hat{1}$$

and

$$\tilde{T}^* \cdot T = [\langle \psi_k | \psi_\ell \rangle] = [\delta_{k\ell}] = \hat{1}$$

Of course,

$$[T^{-1}]_{kn} = [T^*]_{nk} = \langle \psi_n | \phi_k \rangle^* = \langle \phi_k | \psi_n \rangle$$

are just the matrix elements of the reverse transformation, the transformation from the $\{\psi_k\}$ basis set to the $\{\phi_n\}$ basis set.

The quantum experiment revisited

Since $e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}\chi_n = e^{-iE_nt/\hbar}\chi_n$, the probability of seeing 'b' after starting a system in ψ_a and waiting a time t can be written (that is, (1) can be rewritten)

$$\left| \sum_{m,n} \langle \phi_b | \chi_m \rangle \langle \chi_m | e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar} \chi_n \rangle \langle \chi_n | \psi_a \rangle \right|^2.$$

There are two basis set transformations. The unitary operator \hat{R} with matrix elements $R_{na} = \langle \chi_n | \psi_a \rangle$ generates the basis set transformation $\{\psi_a\} \rightarrow \{\chi_n\}$. The unitary operator \hat{S} with matrix elements $S_{bn} = \langle \phi_b | \chi_n \rangle$ generates the basis set transformation $\{\chi_n\} \rightarrow \{\phi_b\}$.

Time evolution is associated with

$$U_{mn}(t) = \langle \chi_m | e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar} \chi_n \rangle = e^{-iE_nt/\hbar} \delta_{mn}.$$

This is also a unitary transformation since

$$\sum_k U_{km}^*(t) U_{kn}(t) = \sum_k e^{iE_mt/\hbar} \delta_{km} e^{-iE_nt/\hbar} \delta_{kn} = \delta_{mn}.$$

Symbolically, time evolution is a linear transformation

$$\Psi(t) = \hat{U}(t)\Psi(0), \quad \text{with } \hat{U}(t) = e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$$

with $\hat{U}(t)$ a unitary transformation.

Putting all this together, the sought probability is

$$\left| \sum_{m,n} S_{bm} U_{mn}(t) R_{na} \right|^2 = |[\hat{S}\hat{U}(t)\hat{R}]_{ba}|^2.$$

The computational problem consists of making three unitary transformations. We start from a basis set fixed by \hat{A} , rotate to a basis set fixed by \hat{H} , rotate by $e^{-i\hat{H}t/\hbar}$, and then rotate to a basis set fixed by \hat{B} .

R

U Time evolution

S

The Emperor's New Mind

Roger Penrose